



SITUATION IN CUBA (MARK-UP) ¹

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1962

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, AND
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC.

The committees met in joint session, pursuant to recess, at 10:35 a.m., in room 318, Old Senate Office Building, Hon. Richard B. Russell (chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Gore, Long of Louisiana, Church, Symington, Dodd, Hickenlooper, and Aiken of the Committee on Foreign Relations; Senators Russell, Byrd of Virginia, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Byrd of West Virginia, Saltonstall, Smith of Maine, Bush, Goldwater, and Case of New Jersey of the Committee on Armed Services.

Also present: Mr. Marcy, Mr. Holt and Mr. St. Claire of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations; Mr. Wingate and Mr. Darden of the staff of the Committee on Armed Services.

Chairman RUSSELL. The committee will now go into executive session. Members of the committee, since we had the hearing here on the day before yesterday, there have been a number of conferences held as to the proper procedure in dealing with the several resolutions that are before us. Some of them were Senate resolutions expressing the sense of the Senate. Others were concurrent resolutions expressing the sense of the Congress. This matter has been discussed with two or three of the ranking members on each side.

Unfortunately, due to the limitation of time and the large number of members involved it was impossible to discuss it with all of the members of both committees. But you have before you as a starting point for our deliberations a draft of a proposed joint resolution that has been prepared for our consideration.

This draft contemplates the reporting of an original joint resolution from the two committees meeting jointly rather than amending one of the several resolutions referred to in the committee. We hope by presenting a clean text of whatever the committees agreed upon, to limit the discussion and controversy to a minimum.

With very few changes, the first whereas—as a matter of fact, all of the whereas clauses, are the same as in the so-called Mansfield resolution.

¹ See Appendice E.

Now, the resolving clause is different. We struck out references to the President and to the sense of the Congress and the determination of the Congress.

If you will note we confined it to the simple language that the United States is determined. Then we proceed with the objectives that are in part taken from the original Mansfield resolution but were greatly modified, and shortened.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

We added, "aggressive" to the words "or subversive activities" on lines 6 and 7 of page 2. The subversive idea was not suggested in the original resolution.

We were concerned about the stating of Guantanamo and passage of the Panama Canal and space explorations and other specific areas that we would prevent any action by Cuba or any force stationed on Cuba for fear there might be some hair-splitting on the part of our enemies that would get us in a bad light before the world, and decided to leave that out and just rely on the simple words that we would prevent in Cuba the creation or use of a military capability endangering the security of the United States without going into all the details.

Senator AIKEN. You would confine that to the United States, Dick, what about Panama?

Chairman RUSSELL. We took care of that first in (a), did you read (a), George, "to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere by force or the threat of force," that is where we undertook to deal with this. Panama and everywhere else.

Senator AIKEN. You covered everybody.

Chairman RUSSELL. Panama and Nicaragua and all of the Spanish-American and Portuguese-American countries.

I had some doubts, very frankly about sub-title (c), but those with whom I discussed the matter thought that we should have it in there, and it certainly can't hurt anything, so sub-title (c) commits us to our determination to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for turning to self-determination.

AS SIMPLE AND DIRECT AS POSSIBLE

Now, very frankly we tried to get this as simple and as direct as possible, where it could not be capable of any misunderstanding. We endeavored to eliminate any line or language that could generate any hair-splitting arguments as to whether it was constitutional or not, or whether we were undertaking to delegate a power we couldn't delegate or recognizing a power in the executive branch that didn't exist or one in the legislative that should be in the executive.

So we eliminate all that language that could possibly be the cause of debate as to the constitutional objections.

Now, when the matter was brought up that we had eliminated the reference in the Mansfield resolution to the President—now reporting the President in its determination—it seemed we were

eliminating him from the picture. When we determined to make it a joint resolution that would go to the President for signature and would, therefore, unify the legislative and executive branches of the government, of course, the President could make such statement as he saw fit at the time that he signed the joint resolution.

We have done the best we could with this in the time at our disposal. We have gone over it very carefully. It is not—we lay no claim to perfection and we will be glad to hear any suggestions from any member of the committees about the resolution.

MARXIST-LENINIST REGIME

Senator BUSH. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman RUSSELL. Indeed.

Senator BUSH. On page 2, in line 5 of the resolution you use the terms, "Marxist-Leninist regime."

Is there some special reasons for changing that from the "Castro regime" to the "Marxist-Leninist regime?"

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes.

Senator BUSH. Why don't you use the words "Communist regime"? I am curious as to it.

Chairman RUSSELL. It is quoted from the Punta del Este Treaty, as you will observe in the third whereas. I would be less than frank, too, if I didn't say an effort to coordinate this matter with the House and they are marking up a resolution this morning, we also had some communications with their committee on this.

OFFENSIVE MILITARY CAPABILITY

Senator BUSH. My second question was, on line 10 of the resolution, where you speak of, "(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported offensive military capability."

Why do we necessarily use the word "offensive"? What we want to prevent is the creation or use of an externally supported military capability.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, very frankly, it would have to be "offensive" to endanger our security and except for amending the resolution I would have no objection to it. I think the language is rather strange.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Although I didn't have anything to do with the formulation of this language, may I just comment for discussion on that.

We quite consistently and broadly over the world aid other countries in maintaining a military capability.

Senator BUSH. Not one endangering the security of the United States.

Chairman RUSSELL. I see what he is driving at and I think the reason is completely sound and I am glad; that is the virtue of having a member of the Foreign Relations Committee here.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. We have not taken a position against a number of countries that have secured some arms from the Iron Curtain bloc for their own internal security and that is a military capability.

On the other hand, the danger comes when an internal military capability gets to the point where it can be instantly converted

only by the simple method of saying, "It is offensive," from a defensive to an offensive capability. It is a hard line to draw.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, of course, I had assured the reason we had confirmed ourselves to the offensive business was that since the repeal of the Platt amendment referred to the other day, we have no real right to dictate to the Cubans what they have on their own in Cuba.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. And the maintenance of a defensive force is a right of sovereignty.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I think it would say the same thing if that word "offensive" were taken out of there, because it would say, "the use of an externally supported offensive military capability endangering the security of the United States."

Senator BUSH. That is the point.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. I don't see that the offensive is necessary in there.

Chairman RUSSELL. I don't think it is necessary. I think we have overdone this business of seeking to placate and curry the favor of our brethren to the south of us, but don't you think that in our position with the other Latin American countries we ought to leave that word "offensive" in there?

I don't see it would do any harm.

Senator SYMINGTON.

AMERICAN MISSILES IN TURKEY

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, following Senator Hickenlooper's thought, we do already have units drawn very close to Russia that are in no sense defensive, completely offensive. Take the fighter wings we have at Adana, Turkey. It seems to me that the emphasis that is being placed on the word "offensive" is over-emphasized. It could get into a question of semantics. We were thinking yesterday about the Bomarc which has a range of 400 miles, and its development was stopped. I think Senator Bush's point is well taken. I think that if you say endangering the security of the United States, you might get out of a semantic disagreement where they were claiming defensive and we were claiming it was offensive.

I think if you run that phrase through endangering the security of the United States, I would be for taking the word "offensive" out unless there is something I don't know about.

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Jackson.

Senator JACKSON. I want to be sure this is included in the executive record.

Chairman RUSSELL. This is an executive record—what we say here this morning.

Senator JACKSON. All right.

SPEAK WITH ONE VOICE

It would seem to me what we are trying to do here, if I understand our mission, is to speak as well as we can with one voice and in unequivocal terms to the Sino-Soviet bloc that we mean business.

I think what is needed is, namely, to have a basis for future action. We do not want to tell them how we are going to do it or what we are going to do. But I think our document ought to be couched in certain idealistic language that makes it possible for the government at a given time to make the finding under the terms of this resolution and to take the action.

I think we are in a stronger position if the "offensive" language is in there because the government can make the finding.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator, if you will excuse me for a minute, the thing that has disturbed me about the words "offensive" is: what is defensive and what if offensive?

Senator JACKSON. I know, but that is the kind of phrase we want.

Senator SYMINGTON. The phrase "endangering the security of the United States."

Senator JACKSON. Yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Well, Senator, if this is a joint resolution it is a law, and it is a more vigorous and solemn declaration than a concurrent resolution. It has more weight and force and effect. It has not particularly enforceable provisions except that it does give authority under law, which is what a joint resolution is, a law for a specific purpose.

Senator JACKSON. That is right.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. In my view, this is a question of individual views. In my view there is offensive military capability already in Cuba. I don't go along with the idea that this is all defensive there.

Senator JACKSON. This is my point, that we can make the finding.

EXPORTING SUBVERSIVE OPERATIONS

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The point is, there is room for disagreement as to whether it is offensive or defensive. I think it is offensive because I think they have the capability of exporting subversive surreptitious operations in the Caribbean area with guns and equipment and all kinds of things like that, even though they don't have any rockets that will reach the United States supposedly at the moment. But that is a matter of disagreement, of individual opinion. I think it is offensive. I think its capabilities are offensive within a limited degree down there.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, would the Senator yield for a question there?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Isn't it clear that endangering the security of the United States, if it does that as a matter of fact, it has already reached offensive capability, hasn't it?

Chairman RUSSELL. It is embraced with that.

Senator STENNIS. It is superfluous.

Chairman RUSSELL. Personally, I have no objection to taking the word "offensive" out. It is in the original Mansfield resolution.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Let me ask Scoop a question.

Scoop, I wasn't sure you wanted to have the word "offensive" stay in or be taken out.

REAFFIRM HISTORIC POLICY

Senator JACKSON. What we are trying to do is to send a signal, if I may put it that way, to the Soviets that we are not going to tolerate certain situations, and we reaffirm historic policy.

And this is the primary mission, because, let's face it, you can't deal with this problem by merely talking about the geographical situation in Cuba. This is not what is involved. The real issue at stake is a manifestation of our intentions, and our intentions have to be made clear that we are not going to permit the Soviets or the Sino-Soviet bloc, because the Chinese are in there, too, to use Cuba as a part of an over-all scheme and device to gradually take over the world.

I mean, this is what is at stake, and more than anything else is a clear unequivocal statement of our intentions that we are not going to let them take over piece by piece or that we are going to be bullied or we are going to be blackmailed. Now, it is that simple, and I think that our language that we use here has to be pretty clear in that regard.

Chairman RUSSELL. Do you think, Scoop, that "offensive" is implicit—

Senator BUSH. Mr. Chairman, would you mind using these things? I can't hear very well. I would like very much to hear every word of this.

Chairman RUSSELL. I was asking, and I don't think this thing is turned on, if the offensive danger is not implicit, in "endangering the security of the United States" because if it were not implicit, endangering the security of the United States it would not be—

CUBA AS A THREAT TO U.S. SECURITY

Senator JACKSON. I thought the key language here is in "endangering the security of the United States."

As a matter of fact, the more I think about it, it would be pretty hard actually to establish on an offensive basis that Cuba is a real threat to the security of the United States, because in the missile age distance is not the test. I mean Moscow is just as close to New York as Cuba if you reason this thing through logically with strategic weapons.

So that is not really what we are trying to get at, it seems to me, if we premise it solely on that, I think sub-section (a) above is a critical part of this language and I am a little disturbed there, Mr. Chairman, if I may tie these two together, that we do limit the exportation of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine in Cuba to actual use of force to disseminate it or the threat of force, and I am wondering if we wouldn't want to maybe broaden that a little bit not to tie it just to the threat of force.

As I read it, "to present by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere by force or threat of force."

If they do this without the force or threat of force, then it doesn't come within the purview of the resolution, and I think this is a mistake.

Senator AIKEN. Cut the last six or seven words off, leave off the words, "by force or threat of force."

Senator JACKSON. That is right. Because what you are getting at is this over-all threat, and frankly, arms are not the main threat as I see it, if you look at this coldly at the moment, to the security of the United States.

It is what is contained in subsection (a), Mr. Chairman, I think, that is pretty crucial.

Chairman RUSSELL. Of course, my own personal view is it would be much more likely to invoke section (a) a long time before we get to section (b), the two are interlinked because our security is threatened every time they take over another country.

Senator JACKSON. I don't think they are going to do us the favor of making possible the invocation of subsection (b), they don't have to.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I see very little difference in the use of the word "offensive," I mean very little difference in whether it is there or whether it is out. I do make this suggestion, though, before we definitely agree to take it out, we ought to have a chance, and Pat is calling right now, to check with the House Foreign Affairs Committee because, remember, all of this has been worked out in correlation with that committee and I think we ought to go along and keep the two together.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Mansfield.

SINCE 1958

Senator MANSFIELD. I would like for the committee to consider in the last whereas striking "since 1958" because I think it could have an unfortunate connotation, and either deleting "since 1958" entirely or substituting for 1958 "in recent years."

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I think that would be more accurate.

Senator GOLDWATER. I was going to suggest that but I think if we struck "since 1958," and "increasingly", and state "Whereas the international Communist movement has extended into Cuba."

Senator MANSFIELD. That would be all right. I wouldn't want to have an unfair connotation applied to this date.

Senator GOLDWATER. I think so for the same reason. If they both came out it would, I think, express the sentiment because this isn't something new, it has been going on for years.

Chairman RUSSELL. They want to take "increasingly" out. Of course, it is a little surplus, but that is what it is.

Senator STENNIS. It is increasing.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. It has been a steady growth.

Chairman RUSSELL. That shows the reason why we are passing the resolution, I can't see "since 1958" and I have no objection to taking that out, but it has been increasing.

If it hadn't been, there is no reason for us sitting around this table here resolving on it.

Senator CASE (New Jersey). Mr. Chairman.

Senator AIKEN. "Increasingly" covers it all.

Senator GOLDWATER. It doesn't read as well when you take the date certain out and have "increasingly" in, but I am not going to argue the point.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, if they call the House, I believe we have almost unanimously agreed on striking out "offensive" and might reflect that sentiment of the entire two committees if they are going to take it out.

THREAT TO ALL LATIN AMERICA

Senator CASE (New Jersey). Mr. Chairman, may a very new man say one word on this?

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Case.

Senator CASE. I only raise this now because if the House is being called I myself think Scoop has a very good point, and couldn't we include the query as to their willingness to take out "by force or threat of force" as well as the word "offensive."

Senator JACKSON. Yes. The threat of Cuba is a threat to all of Latin America. It is not the military threat to the United States and it is a threat to our situation in Vietnam and Berlin and so on. But I think that in subsection (a) we ought to just knock out "by force or threat of force." This gives us greater latitude and it puts them in a state of great uncertainty. This is what you want to do. We want to keep them guessing.

Senator BUSH. That language that you seek to strike is implicit in line 4 of the same paragraph.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Thurmond?

Senator JACKSON. Yes.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say I agree with Senator Jackson in taking out "by force or threat of force."

RIGHT OF SELF DEFENSE

It is more flexible and more comprehensive and I am certainly in favor of taking out the word "offensive" and while I am speaking, I might say that Senator Miller feels very deeply about one whereas in his resolution which I would like to call to the attention of the committees on his behalf.

On page 2 of his resolution, if we can have copies of it before you. Senator GOLDWATER. Read it, Strom.

Senator THURMOND. It reads this way, and this would follow the first whereas in the proposed resolution which is, "Whereas, President James Monroe, announcing the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, declared that the United States would consider any attempt on the part of European powers 'to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety'; and" and he would come in with this last whereas and say, "Whereas the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, enunciated by President James Monroe in his annual message of December 2, 1823, are an expression of the inherent right of the self-defense of the United States."

Senator Miller feels that it is important for us to include here that the Monroe Doctrine is an inherent right of self-defense. He thinks that would get around some points that would be raised in the United Nations on this particular question.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Senator Miller talked to me about that. The right of inherent self-defense is mentioned in this document already. It is in the second whereas already before you.

Chairman RUSSELL. I think it is redundant when we are trying to boil it down to as few words as possible.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It says "each one of the said contracting countries undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercising of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense," that is in the second whereas already.

Chairman RUSSELL. We worked hours here to get words out of this.

Senator THURMOND. I think it probably covers it, but on the other hand, I promised it to him.

SOMETHING WE CAN'T CONTROL

Senator HICKENLOOPER. May I just suggest, Mr. Chairman, for your thinking here, if you strike out "by force or threat of force" of that paragraph (a) from a standpoint of practicality, aren't we setting up something we either can't control or would have great difficulty in controlling? If you strike that out, then we would be committed under this resolution to support the vigorous action.

For instance, the exchange student groups who go into Latin America with the consent of the Latin American countries and there are all kinds of businessmen going in and out and all this sort of stuff. I think that you broaden to the extent that we might have a rather futile area there that we would be committed to either do something about or not do something about.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Bourke, that is exactly the line of thinking that is going through my mind. I was just wondering, it says to prevent by whatever means may be necessary and I was just wondering what would be the means——

Senator HICKENLOOPER. We are all right.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN [continuing]. Of meeting subversion.

Senator JACKSON. That is not the point, though, John. The point is, sure, we will use whatever means necessary, including the use of force of arms, provided that the Marxist-Leninist Doctrine in Cuba is exported by force or the threat of force. Now, if they don't do it by force or threat of force, then we do nothing about it under this.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. If you take out by force or threat of force we are committed to do something about it.

Senator JACKSON. That is right.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. But we are already doing it now.

Senator AIKEN. Sure.

WATERING DOWN THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Senator JACKSON. We don't see by whatever means are necessary we would go to the use of arms. Supposing they knock over two or three countries, would we allow this to go on? I just raise the question. This is what you are getting at because otherwise you are watering down the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine doesn't say you have to use—a European power, we are opposed to the extending of the European system to the Western Hemisphere and the

Monroe Doctrine did not condition that policy on the force or the use of force.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Well, I think that the taking out of the "by force or use of force" broadens the scope of this thing and probably strengthens it, but all I am raising is the question for your thinking, what are we getting into?

Now, we already have combative psychological and publicity forces and all that sort of stuff working in these Latin American countries combating the subversive activity in the universities, in the businesses and labor unions and all that sort of stuff—

Senator JACKSON. I will tell you, Bourke, it seems to me what we are trying to do or trying to say, if I understand it, is that we will not permit the extension of the Marxist-Leninist system to the Western Hemisphere.

This is why we are meeting here today because it was extended in Cuba, and I think that is the sole issue. I realize that it creates some problems but on the other hand, I think we have to decide that question first and it is not going to be—if it is extended into the Western Hemisphere, gentlemen, it is going to be extended not necessarily by force or the threat of force.

Senator HUMPHREY. Isn't the point that Scoop or Bourke is making is that efforts already are being made, isn't that your point?

INTERNAL SUBVERSION

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The point is how wide are you going to extend the scope of the mandatory scope of this operation here.

Suppose through internal agitation, maybe stimulated by Cuban agitators, maybe stimulated by others, an internal coup occurs in which a Communist operation occurs or Communist control takes over. What do we do about that? This resolution says that if it is done by force or threat of force then we move. If we take out "force or threat of force" aren't we committed to move as a Nation if there is an internal coup?

Senator HUMPHREY. But by whatever means may be necessary.

Chairman RUSSELL. They might hold an election. They might run in Costa Rica on, "I am a disciple of Castro, Marx, and Lenin," and he got himself elected there.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You see that happened in Guatemala. Exactly what happened in Guatemala. They had an internal coup there.

Senator HUMPHREY. We took whatever means were necessary.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. We did.

Senator JACKSON. Covertly.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Chairman RUSSELL. It is going to be a lot tougher next time. I don't think this would have arisen if we hadn't inserted those words "or subversive activities." The original resolution read "from extending its aggressive activities to any part of this hemisphere."

We added "or by subversive activities."

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I am not opposed to opposing subversive activities. That is not the point. We have got to meet that situa-

tion, but here we are writing a joint resolution and it is a declaration that has considerable force.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, may I throw out a suggestion for what it may be worth?

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Saltonstall.

PRINCIPAL MENACE IN THE FUTURE

Senator SALTONSTALL. We used the words in the last whereas "from extending the international Communist movement as extended into Cuba its political economic and military sphere of influence." Why not repeat those words down in this (a), we would leave out the words "its aggressive or subversive activities" and leave out the words "by force or threat of force," and put in this "from including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending its political, economic and military sphere of influence to any part of this hemisphere" and then in (b) we put in the military side, but in there we leave out the words "aggressive or subversive," and put in the words, the same words we use up in our last whereas clause, which would, it seems to me, eliminate some of the difficulties that we have been discussing as to the meaning of "aggressive or subversive" and when we might have to take some action if we leave out the words "by force or threat of force." I think that might cover it.

Senator GOLDWATER. Will the Senator yield?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Senator GOLDWATER. If you do that you have the word "economic" and suppose Cuba is trying to expand its trade. We would then have to stop the shipping.

Chairman RUSSELL. This is a very practical reason why I would have to oppose that, is that the House is very insistent on this "subversive activities" going in here.

Otherwise, they would take our resolution and——

Senator SALTONSTALL. I just throw it out.

Chairman RUSSELL. I don't think we should eliminate "subversive activities" anyhow. I think it is going to be the principal menace for the next immediate future.

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing we have left out, and I think it may be quite fundamental. This resolution would have no application if the Soviets directly intervened without the aid of Castro in the Western Hemisphere.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Well, you have your Monroe Doctrine.

CONFINED TO CUBA

Senator JACKSON. That is in the whereas, but we have limited it here, we have confined it. It says to prevent, by whatever means may be necessary including arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending its aggressive or subversive activity to any part of the Western Hemisphere.

Chairman RUSSELL. Isn't it taken care of by your Rio Treaty and the Punta del Este agreement? I thought it was specifically spelled out in those if the Soviets themselves moved militarily against any country we would all collectively in the Americas would oppose it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You have the Rio Treaty and the Compact of Mutual Defense to take care of that.

Senator JACKSON. My point which I want to make is that I believe the treaties refer only to military actions. You are saying to foreign powers that the treaties refer only to military action, yet you are saying to Castro if it is subversive we will apply it. This would imply, therefore, that the Russians or the Chinese, if they engage in these activities short of military action, would not come within the provisions of the resolution.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I believe if you leave the word "subversive" in, that it is essential to leave "by force or threat of force" in. If you take "subversive" out, then I think you could take out "by force or threat of force." I think it turns on whether or not you are determined to leave the word "subversive" in. Because if you get into this prevention of subversive activities short of the use of force or threat of force then you get into a mare's nest of difficulty. If you leave the word "subversive" in then they must do the subversive act by force or threat of force before this particular document, or the mandate in this document is called up.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM

Senator JACKSON. Why shouldn't we say after "Cuba" though, it is not just Cuba doing this but what if it is done by the Chinese or by the Soviets? It is international communism that we are concerned with.

Senator HUMPHREY. If you said the Marxist-Leninist system which was the Punta del Este type of commitment you would be somewhat in line with that.

Senator JACKSON. I think you can't just limit it to Cuba. You have all your whereases and you are predicating it on the various treaties and the Monroe Doctrine and then you come down to the resolving part and say if Cuba does it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. But, Scoop, this is a resolution directed at the menace that now exists with Cuba as its focal point. This is directed at Cuban activities. I think it is a specialized resolution, not generalized and I think if the Chinese or the Communists attempt to do this we have inter-defense treaties and we have a lot of other things that can take care of it.

Senator HUMPHREY. Bourke, the language "to prevent" is a very direct and inclusive term, and that language was related to prevent extending its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of the hemisphere by force or threat of force.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. That is exactly why I say if you leave the word "subversive" in there you have to leave in the words "force or threat of force" I believe.

If you take the word "subversive" out, then you rely on the word "aggressive" which would cover almost everything.

Senator AIKEN. That would cover almost everything.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. If the House is adamant---

Chairman RUSSELL. I don't think they are. But they said now they were able to get only a small number of the House members, but personally, I think something ought to be said about subversion

in this thing. I think there is more danger from subversion than there is from direct attack.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. There is. But I believe if you leave "subversion" in there——

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly agree with you.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. I agree with Bourke Hickenlooper, I think he is right. I think the wording that we have there in (a), 'hat is with reference to subversion, coupled with the force or threat of force, I think that is the best wording we can get and we ought to leave it that way.

A PLAN OF SUBJUGATION

Senator STENNIS. May I ask a question there? That word "subversion" is what we seem to think is the most probable thing that will happen in these other countries.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. That is right.

Senator STENNIS. We have to leave it in there. Couldn't we add something to those words "by force or threat of force," add to them some additional wording here that would apply to subversive activities?

Senator AIKEN. Or other means?

Senator STENNIS. That would apply just to subversive activities alone. When we say if they were acting by force or threat of force or a plan of subjugation, internal subversion, that "subversion" couldn't be used a second time. Couldn't we just add something and cover subversion activity of a pronounced type?

It wouldn't say a political party or say a university, didn't we do that in the Dominican Republic last year?

Chairman RUSSELL. Do what?

Senator STENNIS. We virtually intervened almost with our own Navy.

Chairman RUSSELL. We did it by threat of force but it wasn't against the Communists in that instance.

Senator STENNIS. But, I mean, there was a serious threat that there might be a regime of that kind come into being, wasn't there?

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Yes, and it was force and the threat of force that was pushing it.

Senator STENNIS. We did.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. And so did they.

Senator STENNIS. I don't know to what extent they used force.

Chairman RUSSELL. Of course, I am not too sure but what subversion and reflecting on it, would not be implied in the word "aggressive" that precedes it there.

Senator CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, may I comment to this point?

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Dodd wanted to ask a question.

THE RAMIFICATIONS OF SUBVERSION

Senator DODD. I didn't follow Senator Hickenlooper's reason as to why you had to take out "subversion."

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. He didn't say take it out.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I said if you leave "subversion" in, then I think it would be necessary to leave the words "by force or threat

of force," otherwise we would be committed in this particular document if some Communist haranguers and agitators went into any country down there. We then would be caught in a mare's nest of complicated political activity.

Chairman RUSSELL. We should send the FBI down.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. We are doing a lot of things down there now.

Senator DODD. Aren't you putting a strict construction on the word "subversion" when you put it that way?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. No, I am only thinking of the ramifications of subversion, that is all.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Chairman. I just want to say this for what it is worth. As I understand what you are trying to do is to prevent the extension of the Marxist-Leninist regime into these other countries, whether it is by force or threat of force makes no difference.

As I see what you are trying to do is exactly what Senator Jackson has suggested here. To eliminate "by force or threat of force," it seems to me you accomplish exactly what you want.

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I have some—

Chairman RUSSELL. I am sorry, gentlemen, I promised Senator Church to be recognized.

LEGITIMATE SELF-DETERMINATION IN LATIN AMERICA

Senator CHURCH. I just want to speak up in behalf of the position taken by Senator Hickenlooper. I think "subversive activities" needs to stay in because that is the most likely character of the threat but I think if it does stay in then "by force or threat of force" needs to stay in too, and I say this for two reasons.

First, I think there is an implication in the term "subversion" of the use of force or the threat of force in one form or another. Second, I think if you strike "by force or threat of force" from this statement, then you run a serious danger of putting the Congress on record in favor of a statement that might be widely construed as placing the United States against legitimate self-determination.

I don't think that communism ordinarily gains power by legitimate self-determination; in fact, I can't think of a single instance where this has been the process.

Nevertheless, if you strike "by force or threat of force" from this statement you place the Government of the United States in the position where many other countries will say we have taken a position against the right of legitimate self-determination in South America and I wouldn't want to put the Government in that position.

I think that is a weakening position for us to be put in and unnecessary for the purposes and objectives of this resolution.

GOING BEYOND THE RIO TREATY

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I have some language on (a) I would like to mention.

Chairman RUSSELL. Beg pardon?

Senator JACKSON. I have some language on subsection (a).

Chairman RUSSELL. Very well, let's clear up on what we have practically agreed on here.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I say just one other word about (a). This is, as it is written, clearly in line with international law, and within the scope of the Rio Treaty.

I feel that if we leave the words "subversive activities" in there and take out "force or threat of force" we are going beyond the Rio Treaty and we are setting it up as unilateral action which might obligate us to intervene for some purpose that is not agreed to in the treaties that we have with the Latin American countries.

Chairman RUSSELL. In other words, some South American neighbors will say we have gone back to gunboat diplomacy.

First, is there any objection to eliminating the word "offensive" on line 10 of page 2? If there is none that word will be eliminated.

AGAINST DETERMINING A STARTING POINT

Is there any objection to striking in the last whereas after the word "whereas" "since 1958" and inserting "in recent years."

Senator GOLDWATER. Why do you want to put in "in recent years"?

Why don't you start off with "the international Communist conspiracy."

Chairman RUSSELL. Only because Senator Mansfield said that.

Senator BARTLETT. Why insert anything in lieu of "1958"?

Chairman RUSSELL. All right, we will just eliminate "since 1958".

Senator BUSH. I think that is the main point.

Senator AIKEN. We don't have to determine the starting point there.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Right.

STRIKE "UNANIMOUSLY"

Chairman RUSSELL. The first whereas on page 2, the word "unanimously" in the second line of that whereas is erroneous and was inadvertently inserted and that will have to come out.

Senator BUSH. That is line 4 on that page?

Chairman RUSSELL. That is right. Line 4 on page 2.

Senator HUMPHREY. Reading "January, 1962 declared."

Chairman RUSSELL. That is right.

Senator AIKEN. There were some abstentions.

Senator GOLDWATER. What was the vote on that, 12 to 6?

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Everybody except Cuba.

Chairman RUSSELL. No.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I think there were a couple of abstentions, two or three.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Two or three abstentions.

Chairman RUSSELL. Mexico. I think Brazil but I am not sure. He will find out. We are prepared to proceed to anything that requires a motion on something which is evidently something on which we are not in agreement.

Senator Jackson.

WHATEVER MEANS NECESSARY

Senator JACKSON. Subsection (a), strike out "whatever means" on line 4, including "may be necessary", and insert the following so it will read as follows: "to prevent by all appropriate means including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere" and then strike the balance of this sentence.

Senator SALTONSTALL. How would it read then?

Senator JACKSON. So it would read as follows, "so as to prevent by all appropriate means, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere."

Isn't this what you are really doing? That is what you are doing. What we are saying is if they are going to send out agents of Cuba and so on, this is what the President said in his message, if you will check it, that we won't allow it.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I still submit if you leave the word "subversive" in there you are getting into a mare's nest of trouble because of the subversive activities that may go into a country on a political basis and then are we up against at least a partial mandate to go in there and intervene in the international political affairs of that country which would strike at our own treaties?

Senator JACKSON. Not necessarily, let's be specific. Supposing we get information that the Cubans are sending a boatload of agents into Guatemala, this would cover it.

AGGRESSIVE ACTIVITIES

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Of course, they are sending them in one at a time now and two at a time and three at a time. In all these countries there is a constant traffic between Cuba and these countries they are trying to subvert. They are trying to organize groups, they are especially active in Recife, Brazil, and other places, they are attempting to be active in Venezuela and they are attempting to be active in Ecuador and Bolivia and to a lesser degree in some of the other countries. That activity is going on all the time. Now, we know it, what are we going to do about it? Are we going to prevent that and they go in twos and threes at a time as merchants or travelers or this, that and the other?

I don't care which way you go on that thing so far as I am concerned, except if you leave "subversive" in then I think you have to put in "by force or threat of force."

If you take "subversive" out then I would just as soon take out "force or threat of force," take that out because then you extend it to the aggressive activities and "aggressive" will cover an awful lot of sin.

Senator SYMINGTON. I am much impressed.

Senator LONG. Doesn't Senator Jackson's proposal meet what you are talking about?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. No, because he takes out--by including "subversive," and taking out "by force or threat of force" you get into this political mare's nest under subversive activities.

If "subversive" stays in there then it has to be subversive activities by force or threat of force.

Senator LONG. I thought he was striking the subversive part?

Senator JACKSON. No, I am not striking "subversive."

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. He was striking "by force or threat of force."

Senator JACKSON. The language, by the way, I read it to you—let me read it to you again.

Senator LONG. Read it the way you would have it read.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Let me read it again, "to prevent by all appropriate means including" it doesn't mean we have to use arms "including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending its aggressive or subversive activities into any part of this hemisphere."

Senator STENNIS. Yes, it will.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Yes.

Senator STENNIS. You don't mean to say that every incident has to be covered or resorted to or justified out, but this is a determination to do it by appropriate means in cases we think that are serious enough.

Senator JACKSON. This is precisely right.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I think you are saying the opposite, every case of subversive activity will have to be handled.

GIVING THE PRESIDENT BROAD DISCRETION

Senator JACKSON. Let me make my statement and I won't say any more.

This gives the President broad discretion. It is directed at Cuba. This doesn't mean you have to intervene in every country. If you look at the language, this particular subsection (a) only applies to agents that emanate from Cuba. Let's get that clear. That is all we are talking about. We are not talking about a regime that is overthrown in a given country. This is limited to activities on the part of Cuba. I am trying to find the language.

Senator THURMOND. International Communist conspiracy will cover it.

Senator HUMPHREY. What do you do in a situation like in Ecuador where the Cuban Embassy is itself the center of a subversive activity and yet the Ecuadorean Government is recognizing the Cuban Government and the agents operating in Ecuador are officially recognized and accepted members of the Cuban Embassy. The Ecuadorean Government told us, "We are watching it," and they told us they were watching it and trying to control it.

It is one point to do what Senator Jackson says about intercepting, for example, agents coming out of Cuba, going to Guatemala or going to Nicaragua or to Honduras or any country, really intercepting a boatload of them, saying "Absolutely not, you are not going and get back."

On the other hand, when we have an embassy which we know is the case where the host government recognizes the Cuban regime officially gives it recognition, and yet that embassy is the center of propaganda and subversive activities, and this regrettably is the case in country after country. I wish we could stop it, and I think we ought to say something in here that indicates our activities as a determination to stop it but how you do it by making it so com-

plete. When you say here we are going to prevent it, you don't say you are going to resist it, you are saying that you are going to prevent it and there is a great deal of difference between resisting it or attempting to stop it than there is to say to prevent it.

Senator JACKSON. Well, I get back to my basic point here, it is a limitation of conduct that we will tolerate on the part of the regime in Cuba, and I am trying to find the President's statement. I think he indicated that he would not allow Cuba to be a base to export subversion throughout Latin America. There is a misunderstanding, I am not suggesting that this language require us to intervene in every country in South America. It is directed at the conduct and the activities going on in Cuba against the rest of the Western Hemisphere.

Senator ERVIN. Mr. Chairman, if I may say a word.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Ervin.

AN UNFORTUNATE WORD

Senator ERVIN. I hate to disagree with my good friend Henry Jackson. But I think if you cut out the words "by force or the threat of force" you would have a resolution that would be susceptible of interpretation that we are against persuasion. This word "aggressive" is one of these unfortunate words in the English language that has a good connotation as well as a bad one.

If a person is very energetic he is aggressive, and certainly we have no right to prevent any person, by use of aggressive persuasion, to convert people to communism.

He has that right and if we cut out these words "the use of force or threat of force" I think we would be having a resolution that would be susceptible of interpretation that we intend to prevent any great activity or any great devotion to persuasion, and I think we would be playing into the hands of our enemies rather than doing good.

Chairman RUSSELL. You couldn't do it in the first place.

Senator SALTONSTALL. May I make a remark?

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes.

THE UNITED STATES IS DETERMINED

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, I always regret to oppose anything that Mr. Jackson, whom I respect, advocates. It seems to me we want to remember this. We have headed this resolution, "the United States is determined."

Now, that means every citizen in the United States and what we want to do is to get in here language, something that every citizen can very simply understand, and the language that is written under (a), the way we have it now, with force and threat of force and aggressive or subversive activities, the average American citizen can understand much better than he can by the words "all appropriate means" and I personally hope that we will leave the language as we have it at the present time rather than to put in the suggestion of Mr. Jackson. I would, if it is in order, Mr. Chairman, move that we for further discussion—not to stop discussion, but to bring something before us—I move we report the resolution as we have it now drafted.

Senator BUSH. Mr. Chairman.

Senator JACKSON. I would like to add one word about this "by all appropriate means." That word "appropriate" is bandied about so much that the people of this country are very suspicious about it and my folks down there understand "Whatever means may be necessary" better than "by all appropriate means."

Senator Bush.

DIRECTED AT THE SOVIET UNION

Senator BUSH. Mr. Chairman, I will support what has been said by Senator Saltonstall and Senator Hickenlooper and others, Senator Sparkman, regarding the Jackson suggestion. We started out here to get a resolution. Really this is directed at the Soviet Union, that is what it is directed at basically, at least that is what I think most of these resolutions filed were directed at including the Mansfield resolution.

My fear is if we enlarge the scope of this resolution at this time we are taking on an unnecessary responsibility at this time and possibly liquidating to some extent the force and effect of the main purpose of the resolution which is directed against the military build up in Cuba by the Soviet Union, and I think that is a sufficient reason for our sticking to the language that is before us in this draft.

Senator LONG. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Long.

TO PREVENT CUBA FROM EXTENDING ITS CONTROL

Senator LONG. I would hope that we could consider drafting subsection (a) like this. "To prevent by any means necessary the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending its control to any part of this hemisphere."

That is what I thought we were thinking about. If we are thinking about getting some government out, we would just put the Marines in there, and whatever might be necessary. They are just not going to take it.

It seems to me that is what we are talking about, and if some fellow finds his government is about to be overthrown he ought to call for American assistance and we ought to be there. And we ought to know what they are doing, we ought to have agents in there just like they have agents. We ought to have agents in Cuba trying to overthrow them just like they are trying to overthrow, but when it gets to where we are about to lose one we ought to be there with our own forces.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. If I may suggest when you say be extending its control you shorten the scope of this thing.

Senator LONG. That is what you are talking about, I don't think you want to commit yourself to go to war because they have some saboteurs in there, they have saboteurs and agents.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You don't if you leave it this way. If you leave "subversive" in this way and leave in "by force or threat of force" you have it, you get out of that mare's nest.

Chairman RUSSELL. I don't think we can wait until they extend their control, it would be too late.

Senator LONG. You have to move before they extend their control.

Chairman RUSSELL. Last year we did. Wasn't it Honduras that told us they heard there was a boat on the way and we sent the aircraft carriers and enough destroyers down there to whip the whole Russian Navy, to intercept them?

Senator GORE. And we didn't have to have a resolution for the President to do it.

Senator LONG. If you are going to use "by force or threat of force" I hope you put that right behind the word "Cuba" then because frankly when I read this thing I gained the impression of us using force or threat of force rather than them using it. If you put that phrase right behind the word "Cuba" by force or threat of force then you understand who you are talking about using the force.

I read the resolution and at first blush I thought you meant by us using force or threat of force or after the word "extending" but I would like to have it come somewhere toward "Cuba."

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Put it after "extending."

Senator LONG. Put it after "extending."

PERFECTING THE AMENDMENT

Chairman RUSSELL. Well now, gentlemen, as I understand it in committee we apply the rules of the Senate insofar as possible, and under the rules of the Senate, to perfect the original text before voting on a motion that applies to the whole such as made by Senator Saltonstall. Under the rule, there is an amendment that Senator Jackson has proposed which would be the first in order, and are you ready to vote.

Senator DODD. I wanted to ask Senator Jackson if he accepted your suggestion to retain the language "by whatever means necessary."

Senator JACKSON. I have no objection to that.

Senator DODD. Senator Russell had suggested that be kept in.

Chairman RUSSELL. I get tired about this word "appropriate" here. We use it, "by whatever means may be necessary."

Senator JACKSON. I will accept it.

Senator GORE. Before we vote, Mr. Chairman, would you mind the clerk reading subsection (a) as it would read if amended by Senator Jackson?

Senator JACKSON. I will read it.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Jackson is perhaps in a little better position to read his amendment.

Senator JACKSON. "To prevent by whatever means necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;"

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, on that amendment may I just say one word?

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

LIMITING THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Senator CASE. I do understand the point raised by Senator Hickenlooper and John and Lev, but I think we are in danger, if we don't do something to go beyond force, of a permanent declaration by this Congress which limits the traditional Monroe Doctrine and cuts it down. Now, I am very concerned about it. I would rather say nothing than to do something which suggests any foreign power can come in and subvert any American power and get its influence up to the very peak in this country if it doesn't use force or the threat of force.

I am afraid that says it. I had a different set of language or piece of language for this purpose. I apologize to my senior colleagues for shooting my mouth off here but I think this is so terribly important that we don't, by deliberate action, cut down for all time the scope of the anti-intervention sense of the Monroe Doctrine, and—

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Cliff, will you yield to me before you submit your language? This does not apply to any country outside the Western Hemisphere. In fact, this applies, as Scoop pointed out a while ago, that applies only to Cuba. The Monroe Doctrine stands, and it is the only thing that stands, I presume, so far as other countries are concerned, except, of course, the statements in the Rio Treaty.

LEAVING OUT THE SINO-SOVIET BLOC

Senator JACKSON. This is what concerns me and that was the second point, and that is that we have all the whereases going back and referring to our historical policy but then when we get down to resolving we only direct the problem at Cuba, and by implication, we have clearly left out the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Chairman RUSSELL. No, I couldn't agree with that.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. I don't agree with that.

Chairman RUSSELL. The first whereas has the Monroe Doctrine if it did not I wouldn't vote for it myself. I thought this was a new doctrine and new policy that we were enunciating to apply to this hemisphere and more specifically to Cuba. There is no limitation on the Monroe Doctrine.

Senator JACKSON. I refer to the whereas; is China a European power?

Senator GOLDWATER. Not yet. [Laughter.]

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. But we would certainly invoke the same—

Senator JACKSON. Russia is.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN [continuing]. Policy as the Monroe Doctrine.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. The Inter-American Defense Agreement would come into play by any overt act by China or any other foreign power.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Any foreign power.

Senator JACKSON. No, but the activities going on in the hemisphere involve China and Russia and the Chinese to a very substantial extent.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. But we are dealing today only with Cuba, that is what the resolutions are that are before us.

Senator JACKSON. The problem in Cuba stems from the aid and assistance flowing into Cuba from the Soviet Union and China, and when you get right down to the directive part of this resolution, you only mention Cuba and you, by implication, leave out the Sino-Soviet bloc. In any event, you leave China out.

Senator THURMOND. From the international conspiracy. There is Czechoslovakia.

Senator JACKSON. China is left out clearly.

Senator GOLDWATER. Scoop, I don't think that is correct. We are talking about ideology or philosophy, that is mentioned in the Marxist-Leninist, Communist movement.

Senator JACKSON. Where?

Senator GOLDWATER. All through this. In the second——

Senator JACKSON. Where are you reading from?

Senator GOLDWATER. The first whereas on page 2, it talks about the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, the Communist powers, extra-continental Communist powers, and then it has in it in the last whereas "Communist movement," the international Communist movement. We are not arguing about China. We are arguing about the Communists in China, Cuba, and Russia.

Chairman RUSSELL. They are based in Cuba.

Senator CASE, do you desire to formally state your amendment so it can be before the committee when we vote on the Jackson amendment?

SENATOR CASE'S AMENDMENT

Senator CASE. The amendment I have proposed would be to make section (a) read as follows:

"To prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending its aggression to any part of this hemisphere by force, threat of force or subversive activities."

Chairman RUSSELL. I don't know exactly how we could enforce that.

Senator THURMOND. Its aggression, did you say?

Senator CASE. Aggression.

Senator THURMOND. Does it have to be aggression?

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. No.

Chairman RUSSELL. Aggression or subversive activities.

Senator CASE. I said extending its aggression to any part by force, threat of force or subversive activities.

Senator BUSH. I don't see too much difference.

Senator CASE. I think this is a great difference because you don't limit cases in which you move to those where they use force or the threat of force. You also extend it to subversive activities.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, the first amendment that was proposed was that of Senator Jackson. Of course, if that is agreed to, Senator CASE, yours would not be in order.

Senator CASE. I accept that.

Chairman RUSSELL. Under the parliamentary rules.

OPPOSITION TO COMMUNISM

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this on that point. I don't think we ought to limit this to aggression. That is the word the State Department uses, that they oppose Communist aggression. What we oppose is communism, not just Communist aggression. I just want to call your attention to that because it is clear in the statements of the State Department and their actions that they are opposed to Communist aggression.

As I understand what we want to do is to oppose the Marxist-Leninist regime, their ideology, their subversive activities, and emanating from Cuba to these other countries, so I think it would be unfortunate if we adopted the resolution with the word "aggression" in there as he has it.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator, I am not sure I exactly understand that. I assume we all are opposed to communism, but as a practical matter, if the Communists would elect a President of Mexico tomorrow I don't know whether we ought to immediately convene and declare war on Mexico. But anyhow—

Senator THURMOND. I want to draw that distinction because that is familiar verbiage, I want to call your attention to it, as being used by the State Department. They are opposed to Communist aggression. It is not just Communist aggression that this country opposes.

Chairman RUSSELL. I am opposed to communism in Russia but I am not in favor of us doing anything about it, to go over there and stop it.

Senator GORE. Mr. Chairman, if we stand for anything it is the right of self-determination and if the people in Mexico could freely choose communism, no country ever has, but if it should we wouldn't go to war to overthrow it.

Senator THURMOND. So long as they don't become a part of this international conspiracy of communism the policy of which is to enslave the world and being part of the Western Hemisphere and the Monroe Doctrine would apply.

DEFEAT OF SENATOR JACKSON'S AMENDMENT

Chairman RUSSELL. If there are no further comments, those of you who vote for the amendment of the Senator from Washington will please raise your right hand.

[Showing of hands, five.]

Chairman RUSSELL. Those who oppose it will raise your hands.

[Showing of hands.]

Chairman RUSSELL. The amendment is not agreed to.

Let's see, Senator Long had a suggestion.

TRANSPPOSITION OF LANGUAGE

Senator LONG. I would like to suggest along the line of what Senator Bush suggested to modify my proposal that these words "by force or threat of force" be moved up behind the word "extending."

Chairman RUSSELL. Is there any objection to that transposition of language? It makes it a little clearer.

If there is no objection that amendment will be agreed to.

DEFEAT OF SENATOR CASE'S AMENDMENT

Now, Senator Case, do you desire to offer your amendment now?
 Senator CASE. If I may.

Chairman RUSSELL. Perhaps you had better read it again so that the clerk may get the language.

Senator CASE. The first part would be unchanged and reads "To prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending" and here the change occurs "its aggression to any part of this hemisphere by force, the threat of force, or subversive activity."

Senator LONG. Extending what?

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Its aggression.

Senator CASE. Extending its aggression.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, you have heard the amendment. Those of you who favor this amendment will raise your right hand.

[Showing of hands, three.]

Chairman RUSSELL. Those who oppose will raise their right hand.

[Showing of hands.]

Chairman RUSSELL. The amendment is clearly not agreed to.

RESTORE SELF-GOVERNMENT TO CUBA

Now, we recur to the motion to report the——

Senator BUSH. Mr. Chairman, just one word. I want to make it awfully clear. Have we already eliminated the word "offensive" in line 10?

Chairman RUSSELL. We have.

Senator BUSH. That is agreed to.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, would you explain this item (c) on page 3 some further?

Chairman RUSSELL. Well now, Senator, I had my doubts about that being necessary, but there was a considerable school of thought which thought it should go in there.

Senator HUMPHREY. Was that on, page 3 you say?

Chairman RUSSELL. Page 3, yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. (c).

Chairman RUSSELL. Particularly some of the members of the House.

I don't see it hurts anything. We are going to do it. It is indefinite as to how we are going to work with them but if the American people were expressing their views on this situation in any respect, I think that they would include the idea that we should undertake to restore self-government to Cuba, that is all it would mean.

Senator STENNIS. I asked for an explanation. It is no implication in any way that this language has no special meaning. It is just——

Chairman RUSSELL. It doesn't mean we are going to launch any invasion of Cuba——

Senator STENNIS. Yes.

Chairman RUSSELL [continuing]. Tomorrow, but I hope there is nothing in here anyway that would prevent us from doing something if we knew we could succeed next time.

A SERIOUS THREAT

Senator LONG. Mr. Chairman, might I offer an amendment here on subsection (b)?

Behind "capability," I would like to offer the word "seriously" because in my judgment this section without that word in here requires the President right now to put our forces in Cuba. Reading the President's statement he says this cannot now be regarded as a serious threat to the security of the United States.

It seems to me that the question is when does this become a serious threat and at that point it seems to me it is his duty to put our forces on Cuba. If you can say threatening, I think it threatens us now.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. It says endangering.

Senator LONG. I say seriously endangering. You think endangering implies seriously?

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Let's don't put it. Let's leave it like it is.

Chairman RUSSELL. Let's don't put it there.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. It is a descriptive word that I don't think adds anything to the word "endangering."

Senator LONG. Let me see if we understand one another then. Are we to understand when you use the word "endangering" you mean seriously threaten, seriously threaten when you say endangering?

Chairman RUSSELL. I think we are going to have to leave this up to the President to interpret it more or less, unless we are going to exercise our war-making power under the constitution.

Senator LONG. It seems to me, if you are saying that any threat to the security of the United States requires us to go in there I think we are voting something that requires him to go in there now.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. It doesn't say threat, it says endangering.

Chairman RUSSELL. It doesn't say threat, it says endangering, where it gets to a certain proportion where it endangers our security.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, I make my motion.

Senator LONG. If I interpret what you are saying you are in effect saying not just threatened but seriously threatened.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. I think endangering probably implies more than that.

Chairman RUSSELL. It implies it has to be more than just an ordinary military build up but I don't want to stick any word in there that can be used as any excuse for not taking action if action ought to be taken, to be very frank about it.

I think if we added the word "seriously" might do that. Senator Goldwater has a question.

JOINT RESOLUTION HAS THE EFFECT OF LAW

Senator GOLDWATER. Before we vote on the adoption of this I would like to ask one parliamentary question. If we agree on this as a joint resolution, and the House accepts it and the President signs it, is it not in effect law?

Chairman RUSSELL. A joint resolution is supposed to have the effect of law. This is not a commonly used device but I checked with the clerks of the Foreign Relations Committee and there have been other occasions where similar resolutions have been as joint resolutions.

The last one was the one sent up here that never did come before the Congress with respect to disavowing the Yalta Agreement that Mr. [John Foster] Dulles sent up. He sent that up in the form of a joint resolution so we are not without precedent.

Senator GOLDWATER. You think this would be then a better, stronger presentation?

Chairman RUSSELL. Formosa was a joint resolution, of course.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Formosa and Lebanon.

Chairman RUSSELL. It is better, Senator Goldwater, because it shows a unity between the executive branch of the Government and the legislative, and it shows that the President approves of the statement of determination of policy that is expressed in this resolution.

I think it is preferable to have it. The Formosan resolution was a joint resolution, and it—

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. I may say, as I understand the position of the executive, it is that while they might prefer a concurrent resolution, they are perfectly willing to have a joint resolution.

Chairman RUSSELL. They prefer a concurrent resolution but I think the President ought to be a party to this.

Senator GOLDWATER. I agree with you.

Chairman RUSSELL. I think he should sign it.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, now there is a question that comes from the House Committee.

The last line on page 2 the word "security" where we say "endangering the security" an amendment has been proposed over there, it has not been adopted, but they are checking with us, to change the word "security" to "vital interests."

Senator AIKEN. Let's leave the sugar out today.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. I think we would prefer "security."

Senator STENNIS. Yes.

Senator GORE. Mr. Chairman,—

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Gore.

TO ENLIST A WIDER FRONT

Senator GORE. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to speak since I am late in coming into the deliberations. I seriously doubt the advisability of reporting and passing a resolution, but in the hope of improving this one, I call to your attention page 3 the word "support" seems to me that if you read the sentence without respect to the Organization of American States it would read this way "to work with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people."

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Gore, to be perfectly frank with you the State Department wanted this in here because they are conferring with the foreign ministers in an effort to enlist a wider front in this hemisphere against the Communist state in Cuba.

Senator GORE. Mr. Chairman, the question I am raising is not the inclusion of the Organization of American States. I was merely trying to emphasize the importance and I think inadvisability of the word "support." I think "encourage the aspirations of the Cuban people" would be better than to pledge this country to support it.

Senator AIKEN. I don't know what you mean.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Albert, I believe that these words are taken from the President's statement, I don't know. I think they are in his statement.

Chairman RUSSELL. Anyway, the word "support" is stronger than the word "encourage" and I don't want to water this thing down any.

Senator AIKEN. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Aiken.

REACTION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Senator AIKEN. I am not objecting to paragraph (c) at all, but I think you have to realize if we adopt this there will be all kinds of speeches made at the United Nations by the Asian and African Arab, Soviet bloc and they will interpret this as a promise on our part as to our manner of equipping the Cuban refugees to overthrow a government which is recognized by the United Nations and has its representation there.

You have to expect it but I think we have to make our decision on what is right rather than what other people are going to say about us.

Chairman RUSSELL. I think in saying that, I have thought for some time our foreign policy was being directed from too many places other than here in Washington.

Senator AIKEN. This will be interpreted as an attempt on the part of the United Nations to overthrow by violence a recognized government.

Chairman RUSSELL. I remember that old minstrel song when I was a boy where the fellow came out and said, "Sticks and stones may break my bones, but words will never hurt me," and having seen Khrushchev going to Hungary and getting away with grinding the poor freedom fighters under the iron flanges of the tanks and apparently he has not lost any great face in the world anywhere.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. He had us all pinned down. I am not too particular myself about what all these people think.

UNITY IN THE LATIN AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Chairman, so far as this subsection (c) is concerned, I don't care whether it is in there or out of there, but its verbiage as it now reads, I think, is designed to emphasize the importance of getting unity in the Latin American Republics—

Chairman RUSSELL. Exactly.

Senator HICKENLOOPER [continuing]. Behind us in any movement which we took toward Cuba.

I don't think it hurts anything. Maybe it helps a little bit, I don't think it is vital.

Chairman RUSSELL. If it is necessary to take military action don't you think it would be helpful if we had a company from four or five southern hemisphere states?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. If we want to recognize a Cuban Government in exile we have to have 15, 16 Latin American countries behind us, and we get that if we take in the Organization of American States. If we act unilaterally, I am afraid there will be a pulling away that might otherwise not occur, I don't know.

INADVISABLE TO SUPPORT A REVOLUTION IN CUBA

Senator GORE. Mr. Chairman, if the purpose of subsection (c) is as Senator Hickenlooper has described it, I would agree with it. But I submit it goes much further than that. If indeed the resolution has the force and effect of law, then under this, by law we would be pledged to support such freedom-loving Cubans as may aspire to return to self-determination, maybe we need to support them through the CIA, but I think it would be quite inadvisable before the world for the Congress to pass a resolution having the forces and effect of law pledging the people of this country and our Government to support such Cubans as may want to organize a revolution or a return to Cuba.

Chairman RUSSELL. I don't think that denies us the right of electing or force us to follow a very foolish course.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me read a statement made by the President. It is not in the exact words here but here is what he said.

Our friends in NATO must realize the implications of their ships engaging in the Cuban trade. We shall continue to work with Cuban refugee leaders who are dedicated as we are to that nation's future return to freedom.

It seems to me to have the same sense.

Senator GORE. Well, "working with" is quite different from support.

Senator SALTONSTALL. But this, Albert, is to work with the Organization of American States.

Senator GORE. Oh, yes, I am not complaining about that.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. It is not to support the Cubans but to work with the Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people to a return to their freedom.

Chairman RUSSELL. I point out when you get into this area, it is impossible to definitely define. If you remember the Formosa resolution we debated for 3 or 4 days about what was meant by to include "the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands." We debated for 2 or 3 days and nobody ever told us exactly what it was and we don't know yet. Whether it includes Quemoy and Matsu, just like we had difficulty—nobody will know it unless there is an attack.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. In the Middle East resolution we had trouble for a couple of days finding out what the Middle East was.

Chairman RUSSELL. It took 2 days + out.

PROTECTING THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Senator JACKSON. I hesitate to go back to (a) but what would be wrong at line 6 right after "Cuba" "or any other Marxist-Leninist country."

Senator ERVIN. The thing wrong about it is this is dealing with this hemisphere instead of the whole world.

Senator JACKSON. No. Well, it is protecting the Western Hemisphere from intrusion on the part of other countries.

Senator GOLDWATER. If you go back to the first page, Scoop, the very first sentence expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba.

Senator JACKSON. I just want to make it clear we do a lot of whereasing but we never get it down to resolving on the question of the Sino-Soviet bloc. I think it leaves a dangerous implication that implication we don't resolve; we resolve against a little country of Cuba but we fail to resolve against either China or the Soviet Union, and I say that for the record, and I think that is a clear implication from this resolution.

Chairman RUSSELL. They are certainly included in the international Communist movement and it is aimed at that.

A GOVERNMENT OF THEIR OWN CHOOSING

Senator BUSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to, if I may, direct the committee's attention to the last language on page 3 where it speaks of the aspirations of the Cuban people for a return to self-determination. Now, I think that is very fuzzy language and I think what it means to say is we want to support the aspirations of the Cuban people toward the adoption of a form of government of their own choosing.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator, the right or self-determination has been the fundamental and underlying basis of American foreign policy ever since the revolution when we fought to get it for ourselves and that is embraced within it. Self-determination, if that doesn't mean a government of their own choosing, I don't know what it could mean. Self-determination means that they—

Senator BUSH. It doesn't say government. I just think it improves the language to talk about government if you are talking about government. This just says return to self-determination.

Senator AIKEN. Mr. Chairman, we could get away from Batista by simply saying we support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination and then they don't have to bring Batista into it at all.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Say that again?

Chairman RUSSELL. I think that is all right.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Say that again, George?

Senator AIKEN. "With freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination."

Senator BUSH. Toward a government.

Senator AIKEN. I can tell you now Guinea and New Guinea and the Ukraine won't like it.

Senator BUSH. I think everybody who knows anything will see what we are shooting at.

Chairman RUSSELL. Is there any objection to eliminating "a return to"?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think it is a very good amendment.

Senator GORE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a very good amendment and let me offer again——

Chairman RUSSELL. Let's get rid of this one first.

Is there any objection to this amendment proposed by Senator Aiken?

The Chair hears none.

The Senator from Tennessee.

REJECTION OF SENATOR BUSH'S AMENDMENT

Senator BUSH. Has my amendment been discarded?

Chairman RUSSELL. I didn't know you offered one.

Senator AIKEN. I offered an amendment to get away from the word "self-determination" and speak of a return to a government of their own choosing or speak of the adoption of a government of their own choosing, that is all.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator, if that is not implicit in self-determination I don't know what on earth it is. But we will submit the amendment. Those of you who favor the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut will say "Aye."

[Chorus of "Aye."]

Chairman RUSSELL. Opposed?

[Chorus of "no."]

Chairman RUSSELL. The noes appear to have it. The noes have it, and the amendment is rejected.

SUPPORT OR SUSTAIN

Senator GORE. Mr. Chairman, I suggest for consideration of the committee another word to use instead of "support." It seems to me "support" has the connotation of activity about it. How would "sustain" be, "to sustain the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination."

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator, you may offer that. Personally, I don't want to weaken this. I like "support" better.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. I am not so sure but what "sustain" is a heavier word than "support." When it comes to activity, support you just lend a little aid, sustain you hold up.

Senator GORE. I want to sustain it. I want to sustain it.

Chairman RUSSELL. That is what we are all doing. I think——

Senator AIKEN. Easier said than done.

Senator GORE. I want to keep it alive and encourage it.

Chairman RUSSELL. We recur to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts that the two committees might jointly report this resolution favorably to the Senate so it may be considered under the instructions of the Senate tomorrow.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Do you think we should have a roll call or not?

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Chairman—go ahead, tomorrow.

Senator DODD. I was going to ask a parliamentary question, if votes for the resolution will one be barred from or will Senator Aiken be barred from amending it?

Chairman RUSSELL. Of course it is customary for a man to reserve the right to offer an amendment. At least in Armed Services we prefer to do it, so we know what to expect, but it doesn't bar you.

Senator DODD. I don't know what Senator Jackson's plans are.

FINAL VERSION OF THE RESOLUTION

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, could the (a), (b) and (c) points be read as finally determined?

Mr. HOLT. (a) To prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending by force or the threat of force its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere.

(b) To prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and

(c) To work with the Organization of American States and the freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspiration of Cuban people for self-determination.

Chairman RUSSELL. If there are no further questions, we will call the roll starting with the Committee on Armed Services, first alphabetically on it because it happens to be first alphabetically.

Mr. WINGATE. Byrd of Virginia.

Chairman RUSSELL. He asked me to vote for it.

Senator DODD. When does one vote on this?

Chairman RUSSELL. All right. It is just a little informal, convenient to the rest of the members of the committee, Senator. It is not necessary.

Senator Byrd asked me to vote him for the resolution.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Stennis.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I vote aye. If Senator Jackson or Senator Case should rephrase or offer their resolution, as an amendment, I would want to reserve the right to consider that.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Symington?

Senator SYMINGTON. Aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Jackson?

Senator JACKSON. Aye, with the reservation I may offer an amendment along the lines discussed.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Ervin?

Senator ERVIN. Aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Thurmond?

Senator THURMOND. I vote aye with the same reservation expressed by Senator Jackson and Senator Stennis.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Engle?

Senator ENGLE. Aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Bartlett?

Senator BARTLETT. Aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Cannon?

Mr. Byrd of West Virginia?

Senator BYRD (West Virginia). Aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Saltonstall?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mrs. Smith?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Aye. I have her proxy.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Case?

Senator CASE of New Jersey. Aye, with that same reservation of Senator Stennis.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Bush?

Senator BUSH. Aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Beall?

Mr. Goldwater?

Senator GOLDWATER. Aye.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I think Mr. Beall would like to have me vote for it although I don't specifically have his proxy. He votes aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Goldwater?

Senator GOLDWATER. Aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Chairman Russell?

Chairman RUSSELL. Aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Sparkman?

Senator SPARKMAN. Aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Humphrey?

Senator HUMPHREY. Aye. With the reservation relating to the Jackson type of proposal.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Mansfield.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Aye, voting his proxy.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Morse?

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Aye, voting his proxy.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Gore?

Senator GORE. Aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Lausche?

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Aye, voting his proxy.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Church?

Senator CHURCH. Aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Symington?

Mr. Dodd?

Senator DODD. Aye, with the same reservation expressed by Senators Stennis, Jackson and Humphrey.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Wiley?

Senator AIKEN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that there are two or three that have never given proxies or have not been recorded.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I have proxies for everybody except Wiley.

Chairman RUSSELL. I think I shall take the liberty of voting Senator Cannon in favor of this resolution, he may have a reservation but I know he would support it. So I will so vote him.

Senator GORE. What about his suggestion that all absent members be contacted?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I would like the privilege of contacting Senator Wiley to see how he wants to vote on it.

Chairman RUSSELL. Certainly, there is no objection for any Senator to be recorded until the time the resolution is taken up by the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Hickenlooper?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Aiken?

Senator AIKEN. Aye.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Capehart?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Aye, by proxy.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Carlson?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Aye, by proxy.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Williams of Delaware?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Aye, by proxy.

Mr. WINGATE. Mr. Fulbright?

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Aye, by proxy.

Mr. WINGATE. The vote is 31 to nothing with the right to reserve and three absentees.

Chairman RUSSELL. If there is no objection it will be reported by Senator Sparkman.

Acting Chairman SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest we ask permission of the Senate until midnight to report it to have ample time.

Chairman RUSSELL. We are having a copy of the hearings printed as cleaned and sanitized, including a number of documents, President Monroe's message to Congress and others.

Senator STENNIS. May we thank and commend the men who worked on this resolution which had something very desirable here before its passage.

[Whereupon, at 12:14 p.m., the committee adjourned.]